Pages 1 - 40

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

)

)

Before The Honorable James Donato, Judge

IN RE: CAPACITORS ANTITRUST LITIGATION.

NO. C 14-03264 JD

San Francisco, California Tuesday, October 10, 2017

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs Direct Purchasers, Chip-Tech, Ltd., and Dependable Component Supply Corporation:

JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM 505 Montgomery Street - Suite 625 San Francisco, California 94111

BY: JOSEPH R. SAVERI, ATTORNEY AT LAW
JAMES G.B. DALLAL, ATTORNEY AT LAW
NICOMEDES SY HERRERA, ATTORNEY AT LAW
JOSHUA P. DAVIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW

For Plaintiffs Indirect Purchasers, Toy-Knowlogy, Inc., and CAE Sound:

COTCHETT, PITRE & MCCARTHY LLP San Francisco Airport Office Center 840 Malcolm Road Burlingame, California 94010

BY: ADAM J. ZAPALA, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

REPORTED BY: Jo Ann Bryce, CSR No. 3321, RMR, CRR, FCRR Official Reporter

```
1
     APPEARANCES:
                   (CONTINUED)
     For Plaintiff Flextronics International USA, Inc.:
 2
                             WILLIAMS, MONTGOMERY & JOHN
                             Wills Tower
 3
                             233 S. Wacker Drive - Suite 6100
                             Chicago, Illinois
                                                60606
 4
                             CHARLES E. TOMPKINS, ATTORNEY AT LAW
                        BY:
 5
     For Plaintiff The AASI Beneficiaries Trust, by and through
     Kenneth A. Welt, Liquidating Trustee:
 6
                             BILZIN, SUMBERG, BAENA, PRICE
                               & AXELROD LLP
 7
                             1450 Brickell Avenue - 23rd Floor
                             Miami, Florida 33131
 8
                        BY:
                             ROBERT W. TURKEN, ATTORNEY AT LAW
                             SCOTT N. WAGNER, ATTORNEY AT LAW
 9
     For Defendants Panasonic Corporation, et al., and Sanyo
10
     Electric Group, Ltd., et al.:
11
                              WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
                              101 California Street
                              San Francisco, California
12
                                                          94111
                         BY:
                              IAN L. PAPENDICK, ATTORNEY AT LAW
13
     For Defendants Nichicon Corporation and Nichicon (America)
     Corporation:
14
                              K&L GATES LLP
15
                              70 West Madison Street - Suite 3100
                              Chicago, Illinois 60602
16
                         BY:
                              MICHAEL E. MARTINEZ, ATTORNEY AT LAW
17
     For Defendant Matsuo Electric Company, Ltd.:
                              DENTONS US LLP
18
                              525 Market Street - 26th Floor
                              San Francisco, California 94105
                              BONNIE LAU, ATTORNEY AT LAW
19
                         BY:
20
     For Defendants Rohm Company, Ltd., and Rohm Semiconductor USA
     LLC:
21
                              O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
                              Two Embarcadero Center - 28th Floor
                              San Francisco, California 94111
22
                              MEGAN HAVSTAD, ATTORNEY AT LAW
                         BY:
23
24
25
```

1	APPEARANCES: (CONTINUED)
2	For Defendant Hitachi Chemical Company, Ltd.: WILSON, SONSINI, GOODRICH & ROSATI 1301 Avenue of the Americas - 40th Fl. New York, New York 10019
4	BY: JEFFREY BANK, ATTORNEY AT LAW CHUL PAK, ATTORNEY AT LAW
5	For Defendant HolyStone International: JONES DAY
7	555 South Flower Street - 50th Floor Los Angeles, California 90071
8	BY: ERIC P. ENSON, ATTORNEY AT LAW
9	For Defendants Okaya Electric America, Inc., and Okaya Electric Industries Company, Ltd.:
LO	BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP 425 Fifth Avenue
L1	New York, New York 10018 BY: DARRELL PRESCOTT, ATTORNEY AT LAW
L2	For Defendants Soshin Electric Company, Ltd., and Soshin Electronics America, Inc.:
L3 L4	BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP 11601 Wilshire Boulevard - Suite 1400 Los Angeles, California 90025
L5	BY: C. DENNIS LOOMIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW
L6	For Defendant Shizuki Electric Co., Inc.: DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP 505 Montgomery Street - Suite 800
L7	San Francisco, California 94111 BY: JOY G. KIM, ATTORNEY AT LAW
L8	DI. GOI G. RIM, MITORNEI MI EM
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Tuesday - October 10, 2017 1 3:04 p.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 Calling Civil 14-3264, In Re Capacitors THE CLERK: 4 5 Antitrust Litigation. Counsel? 6 MR. ZAPALA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Adam Zapala 7 from Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy for the indirect purchaser 8 plaintiffs. 9 10 MR. SAVERI: Good afternoon. Joseph Saveri on behalf of the direct purchaser plaintiffs. 11 MR. TOMPKINS: And Charles Tompkins on behalf of 12 Flextronics. 13 MR. TURKEN: Robert Turken, Your Honor, for AASI 14 15 Liquidating Trust. Oh, okay. Now, is that the one from 16 THE COURT: Florida? 17 18 MR. TURKEN: Yes. THE COURT: All right. Okay. 19 20 Okay. Anybody else on the plaintiffs' side? 21 (No response.) 22 THE COURT: Yes? No? I may be speaking. Joshua Davis on behalf 23 MR. DAVIS: of the Saveri law firm for direct purchaser plaintiffs. 24 25 THE COURT: What about the Arizona people? Are they

```
here?
 1
             MR. TURKEN: Yes, Your Honor. We are representing
 2
     them as well.
 3
              THE COURT: Oh, okay. All right.
 4
 5
         All right. Defendants?
              MR. PAK: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Chul Pak with
 6
     Wilson Sonsini for defendant Hitachi Chemical, and my colleague
 7
     Jeffrey Bank.
 8
             MR. LOOMIS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. C. Dennis
 9
     Loomis, Baker Hostetler, for Soshin Electronics.
10
             MR. ENSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Eric Enson
11
     with Jones Day on behalf of the HolyStone defendants and here
12
     to speak on behalf of the defendants, to the extent I can, with
13
     respect to the scheduling issues.
14
15
              THE COURT: Oh, all right.
16
         Okay. Let's do the preliminary approval request first.
17
             MR. ZAPALA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Adam Zapala
18
     for the indirect purchasers.
              THE COURT: Yes. All right. Looks good.
19
20
             MR. ZAPALA: Thank you, Your Honor.
21
              THE COURT:
                          Is there anything I should know?
22
             MR. ZAPALA: Nothing you should know other than, as we
23
     said in our papers, we will be submitting to you a plan for
    providing class notice.
24
25
          We do expect additional settlements to be wrapped into
```

```
that round. We heard you on the last round. We'll make sure
 1
     that everything is in that notice, you know, the fees that we'd
 2
    be seeking on that round and all of that stuff, so that class
 3
     members have proper notice; but in terms of these two
 4
     settlements, that's all.
 5
              THE COURT: And attorneys' fees and everything else is
 6
     coming later; right?
 7
              MR. ZAPALA: Correct.
 8
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, consider it
 9
    preliminarily approved.
10
11
              MR. ZAPALA: Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: When are you going to get the schedule to
12
13
    me?
              MR. ZAPALA: The schedule? The schedule for class
14
15
    notice?
16
              THE COURT: Yes.
17
              MR. ZAPALA: We are in the process -- I don't want to
18
     reveal too much, but we are -- as you know, you heard from one
     of the counsel at the class certification hearing, we have
19
20
     reached additional settlements with defendants. We're in the
21
    process of getting those inked.
22
              THE COURT: Are you going to wrap them all together,
23
     is that --
              MR. ZAPALA: Yeah. We'd like to wrap them all
24
     together because it's more economic for the class. We don't
25
```

want to do multiple rounds of notice if we don't have to, so 1 we're going to try to get those deals finalized, present them 2 to you for preliminary approval at the same time we provide you 3 with our class notice motion, and do all of these settlements 4 5 as one. THE COURT: Okay. All right. 6 7 Okay. So that's that. MR. ZAPALA: One additional housekeeping item, if you 8 could indulge me -- I know one of the settling defendants is 9 here, Okaya -- to just ask that we could get the final approval 10 11 orders executed from the previous round of settlements, the ones including Okaya. 12 13 THE COURT: Oh, yes. That should be fine. I just --I think I may have mentioned last time, our business is 14 15 unusually brisk. 16 MR. ZAPALA: I understand. THE COURT: So I will see if I can advance that. 17 Ι won't have them done probably this week, but I will do my best 18 to get them out early. 19 20 MR. ZAPALA: Thank you, Your Honor. Okay. Now, let me ask you, now that we 21 THE COURT: have spent every year together since I have taken the bench, 22 23 what is happening on the plaintiffs' side with respect to

MR. ZAPALA: As you know, we submitted a joint

scheduling?

24

25

```
stipulation with the defendants. We do think --
 1
                          The "we" part is in dispute.
 2
              THE COURT:
              MR. ZAPALA:
                           Sorry?
 3
                          The "we" part is in dispute.
              THE COURT:
 4
 5
              MR. ZAPALA: I don't think the "we" part is in
 6
     dispute.
              THE COURT: I thought the people -- who's going --
 7
 8
     come on up.
              MR. ZAPALA: Oh, the direct action plaintiffs?
 9
              THE COURT:
                          That's what I'm talking about, yes, but
10
11
     you're part of the schedule as well, so --
              MR. ZAPALA: Correct.
12
13
              THE COURT: -- what is happening?
              MR. ZAPALA: As far as I know, the direct -- I'll just
14
15
     call them the direct action plaintiffs -- have not filed any
16
     indirect purchaser claims, so it's really not the indirect
    purchasers issue. I'm bowing out, Your Honor.
17
              THE COURT: All right.
18
              MR. ZAPALA: And, you know, I think class counsel on
19
20
     the direct side may have something to say about it and the
21
     opt-outs, but we're not part of that.
                          Okay. All right. I feel like we had this
22
              THE COURT:
23
     conversation about two years ago working together on the DPP
     side --
24
25
              MR. SAVERI: Your Honor --
```

```
THE COURT: -- and making sure everybody was included.
 1
    And Mr. -- and the Flextronics lawyer has sent me another
 2
    notice saying he wasn't invited to participate in something.
 3
              MR. SAVERI: And, indeed, Your Honor, the Flextronics
 4
 5
     counsel have been since that time -- and they can speak for
     themselves -- have been included in the scheduling, have
 6
 7
    participated in discovery, and it's proceeded apace.
              THE COURT: Well, what was it -- why don't you come on
 8
         What was it you didn't get notice of?
 9
              MR. TOMPKINS: Oh, Your Honor, it was the deposition.
10
11
              THE COURT: Oh, yes.
                                    Okay.
              MR. TOMPKINS: There are a lot of issues in the case.
12
13
     We're not -- we just want to make sure we're included in the
14
     request.
              THE COURT: No, I understand that, but your letter
15
16
     said that you weren't.
17
              MR. TOMPKINS: To my knowledge we were not actually
     consulted prior to the request being filed.
18
              THE COURT: All right. Have you worked all that out
19
     so that won't happen again?
20
              MR. TOMPKINS: Well, who knows if it will happen
21
     again; but, I mean, we're assuming it was an oversight, and
22
23
     there are a lot of things going on in the case so we weren't
     going to raise a specific --
24
25
              THE COURT: All right. So you're not uniformly
```

```
1
     unhappy?
              MR. TOMPKINS: No, not uniformly.
 2
              THE COURT: All right.
                                      Okay.
 3
          Now, Florida is here to stay.
 4
 5
              MR. TURKEN: Florida is here to stay.
              THE COURT: All right. I don't really understand what
 6
     the Arizona plaintiffs are doing, but --
 7
              MR. TURKEN: The Arizona plaintiffs elected to opt out
 8
     and pursue their claims and try their cases in Arizona, and we
 9
     have consented to the defendants' 1407 motion to transfer their
10
11
     cases to this court for pretrial purposes.
          And, in fact, Your Honor, we are willing to agree to
12
     proceed for Avnet and Benchmark as if the 1407 motion has
13
     already been transferred.
14
15
          The defendants have agreed to allow us to use the
16
     discovery that they have produced in this case in connection
17
     with the Arizona cases, which should dramatically avoid any
18
     duplication, and we're working well with them in that respect.
19
          So --
              THE COURT: You are working well with them?
20
21
              MR. TURKEN: Yes, Your Honor, we are.
22
              THE COURT:
                          Oh.
                               I thought somebody sent me a letter
23
     saying you were not being allowed access to the discovery.
                           That is not, Your Honor, with respect to
24
              MR. TURKEN:
     the defendants.
25
```

That's what? 1 THE COURT: That is not a problem we're having with 2 MR. TURKEN: the defendants. 3 THE COURT: No, no. I'm talking about Mr. Saveri. 4 5 You're having a problem with Mr. Saveri. MR. TURKEN: Your Honor, there appears to be a 6 7 disagreement as far as what Mr. Saveri believes our role in the case should have been and should be; but, frankly, 8 Your Honor --9 THE COURT: Let me just -- I'm sorry to interrupt. 10 11 started a trial today and I've got a number of other things, so I'm just a little slower than normal. 12 13 But so when you say you're having full access to discovery, you mean from the defendants? 14 MR. TURKEN: We, Your Honor, have made arrangements 15 16 with the defendants to get the discovery -- to allow us to use 17 the discovery for Avnet and Benchmark. THE COURT: 18 Okay. MR. TURKEN: We've also had extensive discussions with 19 20 Flextronics. Flextronics has been terrific. They've given us -- we've made arrangements to obtain from them copies of all 21 the deposition transcripts. We've started actually reviewing 22 23 those. We've obtained most of the written discovery from Flextronics. The holes that we had, Mr. Saveri has provided 24

25

us.

And, in fact, most importantly, Your Honor, we have worked out an arrangement with Flextronics so that we will have access to Flextronics' independent document database that they were forced to establish.

Now, we're going to have to do additional translations and they're going to be significant but we've already made arrangements to start on that front. So we think that with respect to the documents, with respect to the discovery that has occurred to date, we're okay.

The problem that we're having is with depositions. What we would like, Your Honor, is, first, to be given notice of the depositions and to be given notice of the depositions sufficiently in advance so that we can attend; second, to be consulted with regard to scheduling of the depositions so that it's not just laid out to us.

And what we'd also like, Your Honor, is -- we're on the same side as the plaintiffs. We're all supposed to be approaching this on the same end, and we would like to meaningfully participate, to the extent we can, even if it means just having a little bit of time reserved at the end of the deposition so we can ask questions.

And what we'd like at a minimum is for the attorneys who are going to be taking the lead at the depositions to provide us with copies of the exhibits that they're intending to use, the documents, so that we can prepare and we're not duplicating

effort.

This is what we did in LCD and this is what we did in CRT, and it was the standard practice between opt-outs and the class lawyers, and we would think that that would be something that would work very well here as well.

THE COURT: Okay. What's the problem with that?

MR. SAVERI: So, Your Honor, a couple things. First of all, we have provided to Mr. Turken copies of the discovery that has been taken. We provided them -- we offered to give them at our cost a copy of all the documents that were produced by the defendants in the case. They turned us down on that.

THE COURT: Turned you down?

MR. SAVERI: They turned us down.

THE COURT: So what does that mean?

MR. SAVERI: So we -- in this case we've received from the defendants about, I don't know, 7, now up to 8 terabytes from the defendants directly. We've -- it's largely in Japanese but not exclusively so. We've compiled it. We can put it on media, and we offered to send it to Mr. Turken and his counsel at our cost. We said, "Here, here are all the documents that have been produced in the case." Mr. Turken turned us down.

So what we are -- we've also offered since -- and we agreed --

THE COURT: Let me just pause on that for a moment.

So is that right? 1 2 MR. TURKEN: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, what happened? 3 MR. TURKEN: Your Honor, we've been asking for access 4 to the document database for two years. 5 MR. SAVERI: Your Honor --6 7 THE COURT: Two years? MR. TURKEN: And what we've been willing to do is to 8 pay our fair share of the costs, and they said they were not 9 interested in working with us, and at this point that's fine. 10 11 What Mr. Saveri, I think, is referring to is that after the hearing that occurred I believe it was on September 21st, 12 13 he reached out to us and said, "You can have copies of the documents themselves." 14 And, frankly, Your Honor, dealing with that -- and that 15 16 was after we, again, had asked him for a proposal to allow us 17 access to his document database. And, frankly, the arrangement we have with Flextronics 18 19 where we're going to at least have access to their document 20 database, we'll have to do the translations, but it will save 21 hundreds of thousands of dollars to reestablish the same 22 documents in the same database, and that's really all we're 23 looking to do. MR. SAVERI: So, Your Honor, again, I'll say it again, 24 25 we -- all the documents that were produced to us by the

```
defendants we're agreeing to provide to them at our cost.
 1
     said it three times.
 2
                         Full, complete production set?
              THE COURT:
 3
              MR. SAVERI: Yeah, the way we got it and compiled it,
 4
 5
     and I've said it --
 6
              THE COURT: How about translations and things like
     that?
 7
              MR. SAVERI: So the translations, there are a couple
 8
             They've already received the translated deposition
 9
     things.
10
     exhibits because they were marked at the depositions, so they
11
     have those already because they have the depositions.
              THE COURT: For every deposition?
12
13
              MR. SAVERI: Every deposition. So that, in large
     measure, is the core of the case.
14
15
          We are also -- as we go and preparing for depositions, we
16
     do translate documents in order to get them ready.
                                                         That's our
     work product; and what we will say again is we're willing to
17
18
     make those available, but we should talk about an economic --
19
     you know, what it -- about our costs and what we've invested in
20
     that because that's -- that's a lot of work product,
21
     Your Honor. That's the attorney time. That's all the review
22
     that we've been doing.
23
          And we're willing to talk about how to do that.
     said --
24
              THE COURT: I thought we -- I thought you worked that
25
```

out with Flextronics a couple years ago.

MR. SAVERI: Well, we thought that we had made arrangements. We have worked it out with Flextronics because they have a copy of our database. Now, Flextronics has been in this case for a while and they've undertaken on their own, because they've got their own case and they're prepared to prosecute their own case, they've translated the documents themselves. And as we prepare for the depositions, Flextronics has -- to some extent the documents have been translated because they've been marked as exhibits, but Flextronics comes to the depositions with their own translations.

So that's been going on for sometime. We haven't had an issue with that.

THE COURT: Let me just make sure I understand.

So, Mr. Tompkins, why don't you come up.

When the direct purchaser plaintiffs get a document in Japanese, you're both doing independent Japanese translations?

MR. SAVERI: Not in all cases. In some cases because we're preparing the case separately, we have translated the same document. And part of the case has to do with Flextronics that we have no interest in.

THE COURT: No, no, I understand. But there might be a paragraph that Flextronics does on its own, but why the whole document?

MR. TOMPKINS: We've essentially used -- we've

essentially had separate translation documents. 1 THE COURT: Really? That's not efficient. 2 MR. TOMPKINS: It was not necessarily our choice to do 3 it that way, but it became the way to get it done. 4 5 THE COURT: Why are you all doing it that way? Why aren't you all sharing a uniform -- my concerns are anything 6 7 from duplicative, maybe triplicate costs; and that raises issues of should we get to fee shifting that's involuntary at 8 some point in this case, I'm going to have a hard time 9 10 justifying that. 11 And, secondly, translations, I don't want marginal differences creating problems. So, you know, Japanese to 12 English is not the easiest of translations. 13 MR. TOMPKINS: Your Honor, I do think when documents 14 15 are marked as exhibits, we've agreed on a single translation. 16 THE COURT: You have? MR. SAVERI: And that's absolutely the case. 17 THE COURT: You're not examining the same witness with 18 two different translations? 19 20 MR. SAVERI: Absolutely not. MR. TOMPKINS: I don't think that's happened. 21 22 MR. SAVERI: Sometimes Flextronics is the first party 23 to take the deposition and it's marked, and we rely on that; and then I think, which is more often the case, the directs and 24

the indirects, who have been working together, will mark the

25

exhibits. 1 That can be chaotic if three people are 2 THE COURT: examining the witness with three different translations. 3 MR. SAVERI: And I can't recall a situation -- and 4 5 Mr. Tompkins can correct me if we've had many of these 6 situations, or Mr. Zapala -- where we -- I don't believe there are really any situations where we've used the same document. 7 MR. ZAPALA: No. That hasn't -- that, to my 8 knowledge, has not happened. 9 10 THE COURT: Different translations, okay. 11 MR. TURKEN: But, Your Honor, that's -- you're focusing in on one of the problems. 12 So let's assume, for example, a deposition is scheduled 13 and direct action plaintiffs are taking the lead in that 14 15 deposition and we're also preparing to take the deposition. 16 we're going to put forth the effort to review the documents, 17 translate the documents for the deposition, and they're doing 18 the same thing. And all we are asking for is that the attorney that's 19 20 taking the lead at the deposition give us a set of the 21 documents that they're going to use at the deposition 22 sufficiently in advance so we don't have to duplicate efforts. 23 It makes no sense.

MR. TURKEN: Yes, including the translation so, again,

Including a translation?

THE COURT:

24

25

```
we don't have to do the same thing. We're going to see the
 1
     documents when they use them at the deposition, so it's really
 2
     just giving it to us a few days earlier.
 3
          And we're supposed to be on the same side in the sense of
 4
 5
     we're all representing plaintiffs' interests. We don't
     understand why that should be controversial. It's not as if we
 6
 7
     are taking advantage of their work product.
          We'll do it ourselves. We have no problem doing that, but
 8
     the difference is going to be with regard to scheduling.
 9
10
     more that we have to duplicate, obviously the longer it's going
     to take us.
11
          We went over the schedule that they attached to the
12
     stipulation, Your Honor. We don't believe that that
13
     schedule --
14
15
              THE COURT:
                         Before we get to that --
16
              MR. TURKEN: I'm sorry.
17
              THE COURT: -- let's just work out how we're going to
18
     handle this. What do you want to do?
              MR. TOMPKINS: We don't have any objection to giving
19
20
     translations to them in advance that we use in the depositions.
21
              THE COURT: I think he wants all the exhibits, all the
22
     proposed exam exhibits.
              MR. TOMPKINS: Flextronics doesn't -- when I say "we,"
23
     I mean Flextronics.
24
25
              THE COURT: The proposition is before you-all walk
```

into a deposition -- "you" being the direct purchaser

plaintiffs -- you will all have communicated in advance about

"These are the likely exam topics I'm going to cover, and here
are the documents I'm going to use"; right?

MR. SAVERI: So two things, Your Honor. First of all, in the LCD case where we were the -- where I was one of the lead counsel for the direct purchaser class, we did it informally. It worked fine. We didn't get any demands for outlines or exhibits before. It worked informally and fine. This controversy is unusual in my experience.

Second, right now --

Yes?

THE COURT: Yeah, but these are opt-outs.

MR. SAVERI: But we had opt-outs. We had Dell. We had others. We never had this problem. Dell did their own work. We coordinated and exchanged deposition exhibits before the deposition.

One of the practical problems we have right now is the -we have a schedule where we're -- we've got depositions one day
after another. Some days we're double or triple tracking. I
want to make sure -- we're fine with coordinating, but I don't
want to build in a lot of process that's going to prevent us
from preparing for the depositions getting it done when we've
got so much going on.

THE COURT: Look -- and I appreciate that -- on the

```
other hand, I don't want a situation where -- is it AASI?
 1
 2
              MR. TURKEN: AASI.
              THE COURT: -- who's here to stay through verdict and
 3
     appeal, if it gets to that point, prepping a deposition as if
 4
 5
     it were the sole examining party while you're doing exactly the
     same thing. It just doesn't make any sense.
 6
              MR. SAVERI: And, Your Honor, I'm fine with -- if --
 7
     to say before the deposition --
 8
              THE COURT:
 9
                         Flextronics, I mean, both of them are in
     the same situation.
10
11
              MR. SAVERI: And part of this is Mr. Zapala too
    because we've taken -- we have all --
12
                         He doesn't want to be involved.
13
              THE COURT:
              MR. SAVERI: Well, but it's not --
14
                          He's standing away from your side of the
15
              THE COURT:
16
    podium.
17
              MR. SAVERI: Yeah, and I appreciate that, and my arms
     are kind of long and I'm roping him in.
18
          But part -- just so you understand, Your Honor, what
19
     happens is that, as these depositions have been going forward,
20
21
     we kind of alternate or allocate the lead of who's going first.
     The indirects go first sometimes, the directs go first
22
23
     sometimes, and we've done a very good job coordinating with
     them and exchanging these exhibits and doing exactly what we're
24
25
     talking about here.
```

So if we're going to be talking about exchanging exhibits before depositions, it's not only going -- it's going to include a responsibility that Mr. Zapala is going to have to bear, and so I just want to be clear about that.

We're fine with 24 hours in advance of the deposition giving them a copy of what we plan to use. We don't have any problem with that, and I'll say it again. We're welcome to do that.

THE COURT: How are you dividing your time up at the depos?

MR. SAVERI: Well, the way it's gone so far is that essentially we -- I don't even know exactly how much time you're allocated, but we have not had a problem in one deposition, as far as I know, about allocating time.

THE COURT: Is that right?

MR. TOMPKINS: We've informally agreed to allocate.

Flextronics' deposition time varies significantly by defendant depending on who we did business with and things like that. So so far we have not had -- we came before Your Honor in the context of 30(b)(6) depositions and asked for more time for certain specific defendants, and we've informally taken longer than seven-hour depositions of certain defendants by agreement of the parties.

THE COURT: That's fine. If you're all in agreement with that, I don't care.

And so we've been -- I mean, again --1 MR. SAVERI: To date it's worked out very well, 2 MR. ZAPALA: Your Honor. 3 MR. TURKEN: Your Honor, we don't expect that that's 4 5 going to be a problem because we're not looking to replicate what they're doing. So if we're going to ask additional 6 7 questions, we're happy to wait till the end and we're happy to limit it. Just as long as a little bit of time is reserved for 8 us, that's all we're asking. 9 MR. SAVERI: And that's fine. We feel like we want to 10 11 have the opportunity to conduct the examination and do the work we need to do as long as that's happening at the end. 12 Candidly, I think the defendants have been pretty good about 13 time limits and not imposing it -- you know, bringing the 14 15 curtain down at the expiration of the time, so I think that's 16 going to be worked out. 17 I want to comment first also on the deposition scheduling. THE COURT: Well, let's just work this out. 18 MR. SAVERI: Yeah. 19 20 THE COURT: So I have to be honest with you, I'm 21 having trouble understanding exactly what the issue is. I 22 mean, I got a letter -- I think from you, Mr. Turken -- saying 23 you've been excluded from any meaningful participation in discovery, and class counsel is refusing this and that; and now 24

I'm hearing today that maybe it's not guite as dire as the

25

```
letter seemed to suggest, but I'm still not understanding what
 1
 2
     the problem is.
              MR. TURKEN: Well, Your Honor, actually --
 3
              THE COURT: What do you want me to do? If you were
 4
 5
     the judge, what would you do today?
 6
              MR. TURKEN: Okay. All we are asking with respect to
     depositions is three things.
 7
              THE COURT: Yes.
 8
              MR. TURKEN: One, to be given sufficient notice of the
 9
     deposition. A couple weeks ago we received notice on a Sunday
10
11
     for a series of depositions Monday and Tuesday in three
     different cities. That was different.
12
13
              THE COURT: All right. Let's pause on that.
          What is the arrangement with Flextronics for notice?
14
15
              MR. TOMPKINS: It's been informal and there's been a
16
     few glitches, but generally we've been able to schedule in
17
     accordance with the schedules of everyone.
18
              MR. SAVERI: And, Your Honor --
              THE COURT: I had the impression that maybe the three
19
20
     of you -- or the four of you I should say -- were sitting down
21
     on a weekly basis saying, "Here's the plan." You're not doing
     that?
22
23
              MR. TOMPKINS: That's probably a misimpression,
     Your Honor, but there has been --
24
25
              THE COURT: Would you like to do that?
```

MR. TOMPKINS: We're certainly open to that,

Your Honor. We don't object to any of the relief that the

other opt-outs are requesting.

MR. SAVERI: And, Your Honor, with respect to the scheduling, we have had a lot of depositions that we're trying to get done in a relatively short period of time. We have a lot of coordination to do.

I think it is generally the case -- it's the rule but there are exceptions because there's so many moving parts -- that we have included -- we -- I mean, Mr. Zapala's office and mine have spent a lot of time trying to schedule depositions all over the planet.

We've included Mr. Tompkins in that process generally.

From time to time to be fair we've just -- we've missed communication. But, candidly, there's a lot going on.

We're happy -- and since the new lawyers have come, we provided deposition notices. A lot of these were scheduled a long time in advance. I believe they have every deposition -- a copy of -- we've informed them of every deposition that is currently scheduled or in negotiation.

So I think we're doing what we need to do to coordinate it. I'm happy if we need to have a more regular dialogue.

THE COURT: Can't you just share like a planning plaintiffs' side calendar or something that plans a month in advance?

```
MR. SAVERI: We do that, and I think Mr. Tompkins can
 1
     speak to it. I think we do it. It's not a -- it's not a
 2
     regular -- it's not formal. It's informal and that works
 3
 4
     because there's so many moving parts, but I think that's
 5
     actually what has happened.
              MR. TOMPKINS: Your Honor, generally speaking, we have
 6
    been able to schedule depositions consistent with all of our
 7
     schedules.
 8
              THE COURT: Mr. Turken, you just arrived. Maybe
 9
     there's just a getting-to-know-you glitch and now we're past
10
     it.
11
              MR. TURKEN: Right. And we understand that there are
12
13
     scheduling issues. We are willing to work with them.
     understand that we're not going to be able to -- and it's not
14
15
     our intention to disrupt anything, but just to be able to
16
     include us a little bit in the scheduling process.
                                                         That's all
17
    we're asking.
18
              THE COURT: All right. Consider it done.
              MR. ZAPALA: Your Honor, I can assure you we will
19
20
    not -- I think it is an issue --
21
              THE COURT:
                          Include them in the scheduling process.
                                  That's not going to be a problem.
22
              MR. ZAPALA: Yeah.
23
     Yes.
              THE COURT: And more than, you know, Sunday notice for
24
25
    Monday depositions.
```

```
And the other issue I think Mr. Saveri
 1
              MR. TURKEN:
    has resolved, and that is the issue of give us the exhibits or
 2
     the anticipated exhibits 24 hours in advance. That's fine.
 3
              MR. SAVERI: Okay.
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                          Done?
              MR. SAVERI: Yeah. I made the offer. I stand by what
 6
     I said a few minutes ago.
 7
                         Okay. Does that resolve everything?
 8
              THE COURT:
              MR. TURKEN: That resolves it.
 9
10
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. All right.
11
          Anything else I can help you with?
              MR. SAVERI: Well, Your Honor, I have -- we have --
12
                          Oh, I'm sorry. Let me just jump in.
13
              THE COURT:
          There's something about Mr. Okubo's deposition.
14
15
              MR. SAVERI: So Mr. Okubo --
16
              THE COURT: Is his lawyer here?
17
              MR. SAVERI: I don't know.
18
              MS. LAU: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Bonnie Lau on
19
    behalf of defendant Matsuo Electric Company.
20
          Okubo is our employee but obviously represented by
     individual counsel, who's not present today.
21
22
                          Oh. All right. Well -- so what's the
              THE COURT:
23
            You're concerned that it be technically a second
     deposition you want approval for?
24
25
              MR. SAVERI: Your Honor, originally Mr. Okubo took the
```

```
He's incarcerated at Lompoc now. We want to take his
 1
     Fifth.
     deposition on the merits and we want to take it while he's in
 2
     the United States, and so we've followed the procedure which we
 3
     need to follow in order to schedule the deposition with the
 4
 5
     Bureau of Prisons at Lompoc. And that's the nature of the --
 6
     that's what the request is.
              THE COURT: You advised everybody the deposition is
 7
    going forward; right?
 8
              MR. SAVERI: Yes, but we need your order in order to
 9
    present it to the prison.
10
              THE COURT: All right. We'll see if -- who's
11
    Mr. Okubo's lawyer?
12
13
              MS. LAU: Mr. Okubo's lawyer is Ariel Neuman.
     aware of the issue. I also am aware that the Department of
14
15
     Justice may be interested in taking a position on this, so I
16
     don't --
17
              THE COURT: Wait for a response to the letter and if
18
    nobody opposes it, that's fine.
              MR. SAVERI: And that's fine. We served notice with
19
20
     everybody to make sure everybody will get an opportunity.
21
              THE COURT:
                         Anything else?
              MR. SAVERI: We have the schedule --
22
23
              MR. ZAPALA: Yes, Your Honor.
              MR. SAVERI: -- and also, Your Honor, I wanted to
24
     advise Your Honor that the direct purchaser plaintiffs have
25
```

reached additional settlements with Soshin and Hitachi.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SAVERI: So I wanted to advise you of that fact.

THE COURT: All right. So those will be coming, the preliminary approval papers?

MR. SAVERI: We are documenting the scheduling. I don't want to get over my skis and promise something I can't deliver, but as soon as we do it, we'd like to come in on some version of shortened time to get the preliminary of which we're done.

THE COURT: Yeah, okay.

Yes?

MR. TURKEN: Your Honor, with regard to the schedule, the current schedule as proposed in the stipulation is really not feasible for AASI or Benchmark. We believe we're going to need an additional four months past the March 9th date set forth in the stipulation for discovery to conclude it.

It's going to be a lot of work because we have a lot of catch-up to do, plus there are going to be a lot of depositions that we're taking that are not being taken in the class cases because of settlements. And so we think that we're going to need that additional four months.

Now, we have no interest in disrupting or interfering with the class schedule, but Your Honor has observed before that you're not really interested in multiple schedules. So our concern is --

THE COURT: It's not a matter of not being interested.

It's just a horribly poor idea for going forward. I mean, it just invites a tremendous misallocation of money, time, and judicial resources.

MR. TURKEN: And, Your Honor --

THE COURT: I'm just not going to do that. It's not a matter of liking or disliking it; it's just bad decision-making.

MR. TURKEN: And that is why, Your Honor, we're trying to include Avnet and Benchmark as if they're already before the court on the 1407 motion; but having five months to conclude discovery -- to complete discovery when we're just starting the process is just not feasible for us.

MR. SAVERI: Your Honor, I don't -- our view is because his clients are direct purchasers, their allegations are within the four corners of our complaint. We see -- we have an interest in keeping the schedule advanced in an efficient way and we're not duplicating anything. So our strong preference is to have a single schedule where we're conducting all the discovery we need to do.

Candidly, we think these cases because they're so close would be subject to a consolidation motion under Rule 42(a), and we intend to proceed on that basis.

I think if they have individual discovery, that's

something -- discovery from the defendants, probably something we don't have an interest in, they should go ahead and pursue it. We don't have any objection to that.

MR. TURKEN: The difficulty, Your Honor, is, again, just as an example, the number of parties that the plaintiffs, class plaintiffs, have settled with -- I think right now there's six different defendants -- very little discovery has been taken from them; and there are, as counsel has just said, numerous depositions being scheduled now just to fit within the current requested additional schedule.

So we're going to have to do that, we're going to have to catch up, and then we're going to have to take the additional discovery.

I think asking for the additional four months in our circumstances is not unreasonable, and it's going to be virtually impossible, particularly because we are going to have to do additional translations as well, to be able to complete it in the current schedule.

MR. SAVERI: Your Honor, Mr. Turken is incorrect to the extent he's suggesting that we do not -- that additional discovery has to be pursued with respect to the settling defendants.

With respect to a number of them that we've settled with, we've already completed the discovery. With respect to some of the ones we settled with early, there will be depositions from

them.

So we don't -- we think there should be one schedule, and if it has to be delayed somewhat so that we can proceed apace, that's okay with me, Your Honor; but I don't -- I think part of what we're trying to do is advance this case on a single schedule officially. And, frankly, my opinion is proceeding on two schedules would be inconsistent with that.

MR. TOMPKINS: Your Honor, Flextronics is not going to participate in a consolidation motion. Just that's not our view. I just want to make sure the pronouns were clear.

THE COURT: No, I understand.

MR. TOMPKINS: In terms of the schedule, we're comfortable with extending the current schedule out to accommodate the new litigants --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. TOMPKINS: -- as appropriate.

THE COURT: Yes?

MR. ENSON: Your Honor, may I be heard on this?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ENSON: Your Honor, the defendants' view is that there should be one schedule. That is what we attempted to do with this proposed and stipulated schedule that we submitted to you last week, I believe it was. We do not think there's a need for eight more months of discovery. That is just far too long.

```
It sounds exhausting.
 1
              THE COURT:
 2
              MR. ENSON:
                          I'm sorry?
              THE COURT:
                         It sounds exhausting.
 3
                          It sounds incredibly exhausting,
              MR. ENSON:
 4
 5
     Your Honor. It's just far too long. There's plenty of time
     for the additional opt-out plaintiffs to catch up.
 6
          There's been -- the number of depositions --
 7
              THE COURT: Just tell me what that means.
 8
     there plenty of time for the new opt-outs to catch up?
 9
10
              MR. ENSON: Many depositions have already been taken.
11
    Much discovery has already been done. The document
    productions, the written discovery, and a fair amount of the
12
     depositions are complete. There's not that much more to do.
13
              THE COURT: But nobody asked about Mr. -- is it
14
15
    Mr. Tucken?
16
              MR. TURKEN: Turken.
17
              THE COURT: -- Mr. Turken's client. I mean, nobody
     ever said anything about Mr. Turken's client at any of these
18
19
     depos.
20
                          That's true, Your Honor, but they are a
              MR. ENSON:
21
     direct purchaser and much of what was done been by the direct
     purchaser plaintiffs in these depositions covered their claims.
22
23
              THE COURT: Mr. Saveri could globally settle
     everything tomorrow and Mr. Turken has a case to go forward on.
24
     What's he going to talk about if not a single witness has ever
25
```

mentioned his company?

MR. ENSON: He can propound discovery within the allotted time. He can take discovery within the allotted time. There's plenty of time for that, Your Honor.

MR. TURKEN: Your Honor, at the last hearing you observed that the time just to catch up on the documents and to redo the translations, it could take six months in and of itself. I think our asking for an extra four months to bring the total to nine months under the circumstances is not unreasonable just to take the time to review the depositions that have already been taken, to review the written discovery, to review the 7 terabytes of documents that may apply to clients that we want -- to defendants we want to focus on.

I understand the position of the defendants, I understand the position of the plaintiffs, which is why we said earlier we don't want to disrupt anything.

So we're willing to play either way. We're either willing to, if the Court is of the mind, to delay the discovery just for our group of plaintiffs; or if the Court wants --

THE COURT: No, no. I'm not of that mind. Let me just ask you this: What are you planning to do with experts?

MR. TURKEN: Your Honor, we have our own experts, and we haven't even had a chance to give them the data yet. We're in that process as well.

THE COURT: You have your own experts?

MR. TURKEN: Yes, Your Honor. That was -- that's been -- and we are -- have had extensive discussions with them also; but, again, we're just compiling the data for them.

MR. ENSON: Your Honor --

MR. SAVERI: Let me short-circuit one thing about the data so we're not here in a month having this. We have all the transactional data for all of the purchasers -- billed to, sold to for all the direct purchasers, including his clients. If he wants that --

THE COURT: His clients are on the --

MR. SAVERI: And they're in the database. When we got the data, it included his clients, it included Flextronics. If he wants that data, he should talk -- he should make that request to me.

MR. ENSON: Your Honor, if I might. I understand the points that Mr. Turken is making, I understand the points and your concerns, but this is, in some sense, a problem of their own making. These cases have been pending for I think a year, maybe even longer, and at a number of the status conferences Your Honor asked "What's going on with the other opt-outs?" And everyone looked around not knowing.

They've been sitting in the states where they filed not active in this litigation at all, and now this is the first time, you know, a month before discovery is set to close, that they're coming and asking for additional eight months of

```
It's unfair to the defendants, Your Honor.
 1
     discovery.
     also unfair to subject us to additional depositions that would
 2
    not otherwise be taken or duplicative depositions.
 3
              MR. TURKEN: Your Honor, we have no problem avoiding
 4
 5
     duplicative depositions. Your Honor, over a year ago we asked
     to have our cases transferred to this court for pretrial
 6
    purposes under 1407. Everybody objected.
 7
         After the JPML panel denied our motion, the JPML panel
 8
     suggested informal cooperation on discovery. We sent letters
 9
10
     saying, "Okay. The JPML has suggested informal cooperation.
11
     Let's cooperate." Everybody rejected us again.
              MR. ENSON: That's not correct, Your Honor.
12
     defendants agreed that they could get access to the documents
13
     from Mr. Saveri provided that they signed the protective
14
15
             That was a year ago, Your Honor.
     orders.
16
             MR. TURKEN: We did.
17
             MR. ENSON: And you didn't get the documents. That's
18
    not the defendants' fault.
```

19 THE COURT: All right. I can't do this today.

Do you-all want to come back next week? How about next Thursday, a week from Thursday?

How does a week from Thursday look? Am I here? Oh, I won't be here.

THE CLERK: No.

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Yes. I won't be here Wednesday, Thursday,

```
Trial will be through Wednesday.
 1
     Friday.
          And then what's the following Thursday look like, Lisa?
 2
                          Actually, Capacitors case is on calendar.
              THE CLERK:
 3
                          What's happening on the 25th?
              THE COURT:
 4
 5
              THE CLERK:
                          The 26th.
 6
              THE COURT:
                         The 26th.
              THE CLERK: Motion to dismiss.
 7
              MR. ZAPALA: Oh.
 8
              THE COURT:
                          Oh, yes. Shizuki's motion?
 9
              MR. SAVERI:
                           That's them again. There's a motion to
10
     dismiss by Shizuki, I think.
11
              THE COURT: All right.
12
              MR. TURKEN: Shizuki or Soshin?
13
              MR. SAVERI: Shizuki.
14
15
              MR. ZAPALA: Shizuki.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. You-all will file by the 18th.
17
     You're going to have to sit down and solve this, so have a
18
     defense representative if you want, or however many defendants
19
     you want, but one person who's going to bind all the defendants
20
     on scheduling. All right? So you on the defense side work
21
     that out.
          It doesn't have to be you. It can be anybody you want,
22
    but somebody has to bind and be a spokesperson or three
23
     spokespeople for the defendants, but they're going to bind all
24
25
     the defendants.
```

Not a problem. 1 MR. ENSON: And then you-all are going to sit down --2 THE COURT: all the DPP's, opt-outs, class, and the IPPs are going to sit 3 down and work out a proposal. All right? 4 5 MR. SAVERI: Yes. MR. TURKEN: Thank you, Your Honor. 6 It seems to me a little extra time is 7 THE COURT: probably inevitable -- okay? -- but pushing things out 8 hugely -- I've got to be honest with you, I mean, you opted out 9 10 and you knew what the risks were going to be. The cases, as 11 far as I can tell, are 100 percent overlapping thematically, legally, and factually except for the slight wrinkle that you 12 have a named defendant, but all that is incorporated in the 13 larger group. So if we have to slice and dice, it is not going 14 15 to be in favor of extending things and starting all over for 16 you. 17 MR. TURKEN: We are not asking for that. We are just 18 asking for a little more time. 19 THE COURT: That's fine. A little more time is what 20 you are on a sticking point on. You're going to work that out 21 and you're going to file a proposed statement with a proposed 22 schedule next week by the 18th, and then I'll have you back on the 25th at --23 24 THE CLERK: 26th.

25

THE COURT:

26th.

```
THE CLERK:
                          10:00 a.m.
 1
 2
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
                                 10:00 a.m.
              MR. TOMPKINS: Your Honor, one issue.
                                                     This is
 3
    Mr. Tompkins for Flextronics.
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                          Yes.
              MR. TOMPKINS: I do want to clarify that the issues
 6
     overlap in terms of liability but because of Flextronics'
 7
     different FTAA position, the expert analysis is of a very, very
 8
     different dataset than Mr. Saveri has analyzed; and that is a
 9
10
     significantly different expert project that has to be not
11
     commenced but it has to be undertaken substantially after an
     FTAA ruling has been received. So I just want to clarify that
12
     it's not like we're just sitting on the same pile of data.
13
                          I understand.
              THE COURT:
14
15
              MR. SAVERI: And I don't think I suggested that.
16
              THE COURT: I get it. Okay.
17
              MR. SAVERI: Your Honor?
18
              THE COURT:
                          Yes.
              MR. SAVERI: We have under the current schedule a
19
20
     discovery cutoff in this case right now of November 6th.
21
     That's a -- at this point it feels a little dire, and so we
     would at least like some relief from that.
22
23
              THE COURT:
                          That's almost certainly going to be
     extended.
                Okay?
24
25
              MR. SAVERI:
                           Okay.
```

```
THE COURT:
                          So don't -- that's what you-all are going
 1
     to work out and that will be the final amended scheduling
 2
     order --
 3
 4
              MR. SAVERI: I appreciate that. Thank you.
 5
              THE COURT: -- ideally, unless something on my end
 6
     requires a change. Final party-driven amended scheduling
     order.
 7
              MR. SAVERI:
                           I appreciate that. Thank you very much,
 8
     Your Honor.
 9
10
              MR. TURKEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
              MR. ZAPALA: Thank you, Your Honor.
11
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
12
                         Your Honor, one final brief issue.
13
              MR. ENSON:
              THE COURT:
14
                         Yes.
15
              MR. ENSON:
                         Has Your Honor decided on whether or not
16
    you'd like to hear testimony from the experts in connection
17
    with class certification?
18
              THE COURT: I have not, and I have some internal
19
     things I need to take a look at, but not yet. I will do that
20
     when I can.
21
              MR. ENSON:
                          All right. Thank you, Your Honor.
22
              THE COURT:
                          All right.
23
              MR. TURKEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
24
              MR. ZAPALA:
                           Thank you.
25
                   (Proceedings adjourned at 3:44 p.m.)
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Friday, October 13, 2017 DATE: g andergen Jo Ann Bryce, CSR No. 3321, RMR, CRR, FCRR U.S. Court Reporter